REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants' representative appreciates the courtesies extended to the undersigned in the telephone interview conducted on August 20, 2009. During the interview the preamble of claim 17 was discussed. The Examiner requested that the preamble features be moved to the body of the claim. Although the preamble was believed to be limiting because it breathes life and meaning into the claim and the body of the claim explicitly refers to features recited in the preamble, the claim is amended as requested by the Examiner. A number of features from claim 24 were discussed and as explained below are not described in DeMarco. The Examiner indicated tentatively but wanted to perform an updated search for which an RCE was required.

All claims 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by newly-applied USP 6,047,199 to DeMarco. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Geneniec, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Every limitation contained in the claims must be present in the reference, and if even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986). DeMarco fails to satisfy this rigorous standard.

DeMarco describes a system and method for transmitting cellular signals has linear power amplifiers mounted on a cellular tower within a tower circuit. The linear power amplifiers provide the primary amplification of the signals which are transmitted by the antennas on the tower. By moving the amplifiers from a base station to the tower circuit, the system and method

can employ less-expensive and more-reliable amplifiers and need not employ high-cost low-loss feeder lines. See Abstract.

Claim 17 recites a method for reducing the number of feeders. The office action does not provide any citation to text in DeMarco that teaches this feature. In fact, DeMarco does not teach this feature. DeMarco simply moves the amplification stage from the base station to a tower circuit so that less-expensive amplifiers can be used and to eliminate the need for high-cost, low-loss feeder lines. Using less expensive feeders does not reduce the number of feeders—rather the number of feeders stays the same in DeMarco.

Another claim feature missing from DeMarco is the claimed "receiver diversity antenna arrangement." DeMarco does not describe "diversity processing two or more of the forwarded diversity signals to obtain a single enhanced received signal corresponding to the transmitted signal," as recited in claim 17, or "a diversity processor for diversity processing two or more of the forwarded diversity signals to obtain a single enhanced received signal corresponding to the transmitted signal," as recited in claim 24. The Examiner read these features on the combiners in Figure 3A. But combining different radio signals together is not the same as diversity combining. The term diversity is not even used in Marcos. Simply having two antennas does not mean that there is diversity processing. Columns 3, 5, and 6 are also referred to, but they describe transmitting functions. The combiners simply combine different signals from different radios 18 for transmission as a composite signal. In the claimed diversity reception, "each antenna [is] adapted for reception of a radio frequency (RF) signal transmitted from the same transmitter, where each RF signal received at each of the spaced apart antennas is at the same frequency and carries the same information," and after diversity processing result in "a single

-9-

enhanced received signal corresponding to the transmitted signal." None of this is disclosed in DeMarco.

DeMarco's focus is transmission and not reception. In the summary of the invention in DeMarco, every "object of the present invention" is "a system and method for **transmitting** mobile radio signals." See col. 3, line 55-col. 4, line 14. Moreover, the text in columns 3, 5, and 6 relied on by the Examiner describes downlink transmission from the base station rather than uplink reception to the base station.

Nor is it understood how DeMarco discloses the claimed "converting one or more received antenna signals into a corresponding number of different frequency signals by mixing with a first set of a corresponding number of reference signals." What is the first set of corresponding reference signals in DeMarco? Where in DeMarco are signals received at one or both of the antennas 16 frequency-converted with a corresponding reference signal and then forwarded with all of the received antenna signals to the base station 32 via a single feeder?

With DeMarco lacking multiple features from claims 17 and 24, the anticipation rejection based on DeMarco should be withdrawn.

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 25, how specifically does DeMarco describe converting all received antenna signals except one?

Regarding dependent claims 21 and 28, how specifically does DeMarco describe converting the received antenna signal on the second antenna into an intermediate (IF) signal, and forwarding the IF signal together with the non-converted received antenna signal on the first antenna to the radio base station on a single feeder, thus providing 2-way receiver diversity with a single feeder? The same question must be asked for claims 22, 23, 29, and 30.

1520558

Regarding dependent claims 33 and 34, the word "polarization" is not present in the text

of DeMarco.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

1520558